I	Case 3:24-cv-02002-SK Document 12	26 Filed 01/05/26 Page 1 of 4
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Maria A. Bourn Anthony Tartaglio GOMERMAN BOURN & ASSOCIATES 825 Van Ness Ave, Suite 502 San Francisco, CA 94109 Telephone: (415) 545-8608 Email: maria@gobolaw.com tony@gobolaw.com Attorneys for Plaintiff NEELAM SANDHU	KATHERINE M. FORSTER (State Bar No. 217609) Katherine.Forster@mto.com CRAIG JENNINGS LAVOIE (State Bar No. 293079) Craig.Lavoie@mto.com KYRA E. SCHOONOVER (State Bar No. 343166) Kyra.Schoonover@mto.com MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP 350 South Grand Avenue, Fiftieth Floor Los Angeles, California 90071-3426 Telephone: (213) 683-9100 Facsimile: (213) 687-3702 Attorneys for Defendant BLACKBERRY CORPORATION
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
13	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
14	NEELAM SANDHU, an individual,	Case No.: 3:24-cv-02002
15	Plaintiff,	FIFTH JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE STATEMENT
16	VS.	CONTENENCE STATEMENT
17	BLACKBERRY CORPORATION; a Delaware Corporation,	Date: January 12, 2025
18	Defendant.	Time 1:30 pm Judge: Hon. Sallie Kim
19		
20 21	Plaintiff Neelam Sandhu and Defendant BlackBerry Corporation hereby submit this fourth	
21 22	joint case management conference statement in advance of the January 12, 2025, case	
23	management conference.	
24	Jurisdiction and Service: This case is based on diversity jurisdiction in which the	
25	substantive law of California applies. There are currently no issues regarding personal	
26	jurisdiction or venue. There are no parties remaining to be served.	
27		
28		
	55741094.1 FIFTH JOINT CASE MANA	- 1 - GEMENT CONFERENCE STATEMENT
	FIFTH JOINT CASE MANA	SEMENT CONTENENCE STATEMENT

Facts:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Plaintiff's Position: Plaintiff alleges BlackBerry discriminated against Plaintiff based on her gender, violating the Fair Employment and Housing Act and subsequently retaliated against her after reporting John Giamatteo's sexual and/or gender harassment. Plaintiff alleges BlackBerry's failure also violated FEHA because it failed to prevent harassment, retaliation, and discrimination. Plaintiff also alleged BlackBerry failed to properly pay her based on her gender and that Giamatteo harassed her based on her gender/sex, but the Court dismissed the claims on a motion to dismiss. Plaintiff still contends Defendants' conduct was illegal and resulted in her wrongful termination in violation of public policy.

Defendant's Position: Defendant strongly denies all of Plaintiff's allegations. Defendant's position is that BlackBerry did not engage in any alleged discrimination or retaliation, and that Giamatteo did not engage in harassment or retaliation. BlackBerry terminated Plaintiff as a result of a corporate restructuring, and not for any discriminatory or retaliatory reason.

Legal Issues: The Court granted-in-part a motion to dismiss. Defendant filed a summaryjudgment motion, which is pending.

Motions: Defendant has filed a summary-judgment motion. Plaintiff is considering a motion to exclude an expert for failing to disclose information he relied upon. At this time, no other motions are contemplated (besides pre-trial motions in limine).

Amendment of Pleadings: At this time, no other amendments to the pleadings are contemplated.

Evidence Preservation: The parties are aware of their obligations to preserve potentially relevant evidence. They have also discussed this issue.

Disclosures: The parties have served initial disclosures.

Discovery: The parties have completed fact discovery and expert discovery.

Class Actions: This is not a class action.

Related Cases: There appear to be no cases that should be related to this one.

Relief: Plaintiff's economist expert has opined that Plaintiff lost \$1,004,196 in economic damages (which Defendant disputes). Plaintiff will also seek non-economic damages for

55741094.1

1	emotional harm, punitive damages, costs, and attorney's fees. It is up to the jury to select the	
2	amount of emotional-harm and punitive damages (if any). Defendant's position is that Plaintiff	
3	should take nothing.	
4	Settlement and ADR: The parties attended mediation December 22, 2025, and did not	
5	reach a resolution.	
6	Other References: This case is not suitable for binding arbitration, a special master, or an	
7	MDL panel.	
8	Narrowing of Issues: Defendant filed a summary-judgment motion that, if not granted in	
9	its entirety, might in the alternative narrow the scope of the case.	
10	Scheduling : The Court has issued a scheduling order already. Currently, no party is	
11	seeking an amendment to the case schedule.	
12	<u>Trial</u> : The Court has ordered that trial shall begin on May 12, 2026 and last no longer	
13	than seven days.	
14	<u>Disclosure of Non-party Interested Entities or Persons</u> : The parties have filed the	
15	required disclosure form.	
16	<u>Professional Conduct</u> : The attorneys of record for the parties are familiar with the	
17	applicable rules of professional conduct.	
18		
19		
20	Dated: January 5, 2026 GOMERMAN BOURN & ASSOCIATES	
21	By:/s/ Anthony Tartaglio	
22	Maria Bourn Anthony Tartaglio	
23	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
24	Neelam Sandhu	
25		
26		
27		
28		
	55741094.1 - 3 - FIFTH JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE STATEMENT	
	FIFTH COLUT CASE MANAGEMENT CONTENENCE STATEMENT	